

A GENERALIZATION OF QUANTALES WITH APPLICATIONS TO MODULES AND RINGS

MAURICIO GABRIEL MEDINA-BÁRCENAS
 LUIS ANGEL ZALDÍVAR-CORICHI
 MARTHA LIZBETH SHAID SANDOVAL-MIRANDA

ABSTRACT. In this paper we introduce a lattice structure as a generalization of meet-continuous lattices and quantales. We develop a point-free approach to these new lattices and apply these results to R -modules. In particular, we give a module counterpart of the well known result that in a commutative ring the set of semiprime ideals, that is, radical ideals is a frame.

1. INTRODUCTION

In general, for the study of rings and modules, the complete lattices of submodules play an important role, there are various forms for the examination of these lattices, like via pure lattice theory or in a categorical point of view. In the study of rings there are other lattice-structures in play, like preradicals, torsion theories, linear filters etc. In the eye of this doctrine, we introduce a framework of lattice structure theory to analyze the submodules of a given module and preradicals on a ring, in particular we specialize in the lattice of submodules and we give some characterizations of these.

In [17] and [16], the authors introduce some order-lattice structures for studying rings, topological spaces and more. In particular, in [17], the author considers lattices equipped with a product in which an absolute distribution holds with respect to take suprema and certain comparisons between the $\wedge$ and this product must be hold. He calls these kind of lattices *carries*, and by the definition these ones are particular examples of *quantales*. From this theory one can describe interesting phenomena of ring theory like *radical theory*. This is one of our motivations in the scope of a more general situation, which is determinate radicals in the sense of rings but now for modules. Other important structures for studying rings and modules are *idioms* and *frames*. Recall that idioms are complete modular meet-continuous lattices, therefore they are a kind of generalization of frames. Another generalization of frames are quantales. With this in mind, one of our first goals is to introduce a generalization of idioms and quantales in which both of them are particular cases.

This paper is organized as follows: in section 2 we give a brief introduction of the notation and some examples that motivate our study, in section 3 we introduce a general framework for the study of quantales and idioms, we generalize some results of localic nuclei in quantale theory. In last section, we apply these notions to the idiom of submodules and we generalize some classical structure theorems in commutative ring theory .

2. PRELIMINARIES AND BACKGROUND MATERIAL

Throughout this paper, we will work with complete lattices in the usual sense. Recall that a $\vee$ -semilattice is an structure $(A, \leq, \vee, 0)$, where $(A, \leq)$ is a partial ordered set with bottom element 0 and a binary operation $\vee$ such that $x \vee y \leq z$ if and only if $x \leq z$ and $y \leq z$, for all, $a, y, z \in A$. Also all the $\vee$ -semilattices we considered here are complete with respect $\vee$. A morphisms of $\vee$ -semilattices, $f: A \rightarrow B$ is a monotone function that preserves arbitrary suprema, that is, $f[\vee X] = \vee f[X]$ for all $X \subseteq A$. Then, by the adjoint functor theorem it follows that any morphism of $\vee$ -semilattices, namely $f: A \rightarrow B$, has a right adjoint $f_*: B \rightarrow A$. Denoting $f = f_*$, the composition $d = f_*f^*: A \rightarrow A$ is a closure operation, that is, d is a monotone function, $a \leq d(a)$ and $dd = d$. It can be shown that any of these operators rises naturally in this way.

Here our analysis is concentrated in certain kind of $\vee$ -semilattices. Those are the following:

A lattice A is *meet-continuous* if

$$(IDL), \quad a \wedge \left(\bigvee X \right) = \bigvee \{a \wedge x \mid x \in X\}$$

for all $a \in A$ and $X \subseteq A$ any directed set. Here, X is *directed* if it is non-empty and for each $x, y \in X$ there is some $z \in X$ with $x \leq z$ and $y \leq z$.

A lattice A is *modular* if $(a \vee c) \wedge b = a \vee (c \wedge b)$, for all $a, b, c \in A$ such that $a \leq b$.

An *idiom* is a meet-continuous modular lattice. An important class of idioms are the well known *frames*. Recall that a complete lattice A is a *frame* if

$$(FDL) \quad a \wedge \left(\bigvee X \right) = \bigvee \{a \wedge x \mid x \in X\}$$

holds for every $a \in A$ and every $X \subseteq A$.

On the other hand, for any lattice A , an *implication* is a two placed operation $(- \succ -)$ given by $x \leq (a \succ b) \Leftrightarrow x \wedge b \leq a$, for all $a, b \in A$.

The distributivity law (FDL) characterizes frames as follows.

Proposition 2.1. *A complete lattice A is a frame if and only if A has an implication.*

This implies that in a frame A any element $a \in A$ has a *negation* ($a \succ \underline{0}$) or simply $\neg a$. A proof of 2.1 and general background about idioms and frames can be viewed in [19], [11] and [20]. Some interesting examples of idioms and frames are:

Example 2.2.

- (1) Given an associative unital ring R consider the category of left R -modules, $R\text{-Mod}$ and for every $M \in R\text{-Mod}$, denote by $\Lambda(M)$ the left submodules of M . It is well known that $\Lambda(M)$ is a complete meet-continuous modular lattice, whence an idiom.
- (2) Consider any topological space S and denote by $\mathcal{O}(S)$ the open subsets of S . This is the generic non-trivial example of a frame.

So any morphism of idioms (in particular of frames) as subcategories of the category of $\vee$ -semilattices gives closure operators, we shall summarize systematically the definition of these operators.

An *inflator* in a idiom A is a function $d: A \rightarrow A$ such that $x \leq d(x)$ and $x \leq y \Rightarrow d(x) \leq d(y)$. A *pre-nucleus* d on A is an inflator such that $d(x \wedge y) =$

$d(x) \wedge d(y)$. A *stable inflator* on A is an inflator such that $d(x) \wedge y \leq d(x \wedge y)$ for all $x, y \in A$. Let us denote by $I(A)$ the set of all inflators on A and let $P(A)$ be the set of all pre-nuclei and $S(A)$ the set of all stable inflators. Clearly, $P(A) \subseteq S(A) \subseteq I(A)$. Note that from the definition of inflator, the composition of any two inflators is again an inflator. In fact, $I(A)$ is a poset with the order given for $d, d' \in I(A)$ by $d \leq d' \Leftrightarrow d(a) \leq d'(a)$, for all $a \in A$. The identity d_0 of A and the constant function $\bar{d}(a) = \bar{1}$ for all $a \in A$, are inflators. Furthermore, these ones are pre-nuclei.

For any two inflators d, d' on A and for all $a \in A$ we have $a \leq d(a)$. From the monotonicity of d' it follows that $d'(a) \leq d'(d(a))$, and again we have $d'(d(a)) \geq d(a)$. Therefore, if A is an idiom, then for any two inflators $d, d' \in I(A)$ we have that $d' \vee d \leq d'd$. It follows the next:

Lemma 2.3. *If A is an idiom and d, d', k are inflators over A , then:*

- (1) *If $d \leq d'$, then $kd \leq kd'$ and $dk \leq d'k$.*
- (2) *$kd' \vee kd \leq k(d' \vee d)$ and $k(d' \wedge d) \leq kd' \wedge kd$.*
- (3) *Moreover, if $\mathcal{D} \subseteq I(A)$ is non empty, then:*
 - (a) $(\bigvee \mathcal{D})k = \bigvee \{dk \mid d \in \mathcal{D}\}$,
 - (b) $(\bigwedge \mathcal{D})k = \bigwedge \{dk \mid d \in \mathcal{D}\}$.

The properties of the composition of inflators gives a crucial construction:

Given an inflator $d \in I(A)$, let $d^0 := d_0$, $d^{\alpha+1} := d \circ d^\alpha$ for a non-limit ordinal α , and let $d^\lambda := \bigvee \{d^\alpha \mid \alpha < \lambda\}$ for a limit ordinal λ . These are inflators, and from the comparison $d \vee d' \leq dd'$, we have a chain of inflators

$$d \leq d^2 \leq d^3 \leq \dots \leq d^\alpha \leq \dots$$

By a cardinality argument, there exists an ordinal γ such that $d^\alpha = d^\gamma$, for $\alpha \geq \gamma$. In fact, we can choose γ the least of these ordinals, say ∞ . Thus, d^∞ is an inflator which not only satisfies $d \leq d^\infty$ but also $d^\infty d^\infty = d^\infty$, that is, d^∞ is an idempotent or closure operator over A . Denote by $C(A)$ the set of all closure operators. This is a poset in which the infimum of a set of closure operators is again a closure operator. Hence, it is a complete lattice, and the construction we just made defines an operator $(-)^\infty: I(A) \rightarrow C(A)$. It is clear that this operation (in the second level) is inflatory and monotone. The supremum in $C(A)$ for an arbitrary family of closure operators can be computed as follows: first, take a non-empty subset of closure operators $\mathcal{C}$ on A . By the observations of the supremum, $\bigvee \mathcal{C}$ is an inflator, so we can apply the construction above and obtain a closure operator $(\bigvee \mathcal{C})^\infty$, this is the supremum of the family $\mathcal{C}$ in $C(A)$. For an inflator j over an idiom A , we say that j is a *nucleus* if is an idempotent pre-nucleus. By induction and distributivity on idioms, it follows that if A is an idiom, then:

- (1) *If f is a pre-nucleus on A , then f^α is a pre-nucleus. In particular, f^∞ is a nucleus.*
- (2) *If f is a stable inflator, then each f^α is a pre-nucleus, and for limit ordinals λ , f^λ is a pre-nucleus. In particular, f^∞ is a nucleus.*

One of the most important observations in the inflator theory is:

Theorem 2.4. *For any idiom A , denote by $N(A)$ the set of all nuclei on A then, the complete lattice $N(A)$ is a frame.*

Most of the structural analysis of idioms is related with the frame $N(A)$, as ranking techniques, dimensions and other point free-theoretical constructions. In

particular, every nucleus j on A determines a quotient of the idiom, the set of all fixed points of j , A_j together with an idiom morphism $j^*: A \rightarrow A_j$ given by $j^*(a) = j(a)$.

There are other $\bigvee$ -semilattices structures that we need to mention.

Let Q be a $\bigvee$ -semilattice, Q is a *quantale* if Q has a binary associative operation $\cdot : Q \times Q \rightarrow Q$ such that

$$(LQ) \quad l \left(\bigvee X \right) = \bigvee \{lx \mid x \in X\}, \text{ and}$$

$$(RQ) \quad \left(\bigvee X \right) r = \bigvee \{xr \mid x \in X\}$$

hold for all $l, r \in Q$ and $X \subseteq Q$.

Notice that if in the previous definition we assume meets instead of joins, then we obtain the dual quantale with respect to meets.

In case that only (LQ) (respectely (RQ)) holds, some authors just say that Q is a left quantale (respectely right quantale).

Note that any frame is a quantal, with the operation $\wedge$, in fact:

Proposition 2.5. *Let $(Q, \leq, \bigvee, 0, \cdot)$ be a quantale. Then, Q is a frame if and only if $(Q, \cdot, e)$ is a monoid with unital element $e = 1$ and each element is idempotent with respect $\cdot$, here 1 is the top of the complete lattice $(Q, \leq, \bigvee, 0, 1)$.*

Now the morphisms of quantales are $\bigvee$ -morphisms such that respect the product. As in the case of idioms, we have the concept of inflator. In particular, we have that an inflator $d : Q \rightarrow Q$ on a quantale is *stable* if $ld(x) \leq d(lx)$ and $d(x)r \leq d(xr)$ for all $x, l, r \in Q$. A *pre-nucleus* in Q is an inflator d such that $d(x)d(y) \leq d(xy)$ holds for all $x, y \in Q$. In this sense, a *quantic nucleus* on Q is an idempotent pre-nucleus j on Q . In general, the set of all nuclei $N(Q)$ is a complete lattice which is not a quantale, but the complete lattice structure ensures that there exists a unique quantic nucleus $\sigma \in N(Q)$ such that for each quantic nucleus $k \in N(Q)$, the set of fixed points of k , Q_k , that is a quotient of Q , is a frame if and only if $\sigma \leq k$. The latter is proved in [16, Lemma 3.2.5]. There are more interesting families of inflators controlling the product and its comparison with $\wedge$ on Q .

Some examples of quantales, as we mentioned before, are frames. Other examples come from ring theory. The lattice of left ideals, the one of right ideals and that of two sided ideals with the usual product, are examples of quantales. On the other hand, notice that R -fil the lattice of all preradical filters with the operation of Gabriel multiplication of preradical filters satisfies (LQ), i.e. is a left quantale. See [7, 3.13 Proposition].

3. QUASI-QUANTALES

Definition 3.1. Let A be a $\bigvee$ -semilattice. We say that A is a *quasi-quantale* if it has an associative product $A \times A \rightarrow A$ such that for all directed subsets $X, Y \subseteq A$ and $a \in A$:

$$(RDQ) \quad \left(\bigvee X \right) a = \bigvee \{xa \mid x \in X\},$$

and

$$(LDQ) \quad a \left(\bigvee Y \right) = \bigvee \{ay \mid y \in Y\}.$$

We say A is a *left-unital* (resp. *right-unital*, resp. *bilateral-unital*) *quasi-quantale* if there exists $e \in A$ such that $e(a) = a$ (resp. $(a)e = a$, resp. $e(a) = a = (a)e$) for all $a \in A$.

Example 3.2.

- (1) If A is an idiom, then A is a bilateral-unital quasi-quantale with $\wedge: A \times A \rightarrow A$.
- (2) Let R be a ring with identity and let $Bil(R) = \{I \subseteq R \mid I \text{ bilateral ideal}\}$. Then $Bil(R)$ is a bilateral-unital quasi-quantale with the product of ideals. Notice that $RI = I = IR$ for all $I \in Bil(R)$. Moreover, $Bil(R)$ satisfies

$$\left(\sum_{\mathcal{J}} I_i \right) J = \sum_{\mathcal{J}} (I_i J)$$

and

$$J \left(\sum_{\mathcal{J}} I_i \right) = \sum_{\mathcal{J}} (JI_i),$$

for all $\{I_i\}_{\mathcal{J}} \subseteq Bil(R)$.

Now, note that $\Lambda(R) = \{I \subseteq R \mid I \text{ is a left ideal}\}$ satisfies the latter distributive laws but it is just a left-unital quasi-quantale.

- (3) Let $R\text{-pr}$ be the big lattice of preradicals on $R\text{-Mod}$, where the order is given as follows: $r, s \in R\text{-pr}$ if and only if $r(M) \leq s(M)$ for all $M \in R\text{-Mod}$. Their infimum $r \wedge s$ and supremum $r \vee s$ are defined as $(r \wedge s)(M) = r(M) \cap s(M)$ and $(r \vee s)(M) = r(M) + s(M)$ for every $M \in R\text{-Mod}$, respectively. In fact, by [12, Theorem 8, 1.(b)] it follows that $R\text{-pr}$ is a bilateral-unital quasi-quantale which is not a quantale with $\wedge$ as product.

On the other hand, given $r, s \in R\text{-pr}$ consider their product rs which is defined as $(rs)(M) = r(s(M))$, for every $M \in R\text{-Mod}$. Notice that $R\text{-pr}$ with this product just satisfies (RQD). See [12, Theorem 8, 2.(b)].

- (4) Let A be a lattice. The set of all inflators on A , denoted by $D(A)$ just satisfies (RQ) so in particular (RDQ). See Lemma 2.3 (3) (a) and [20].
- (5) Let M be a left R -module. Given $N, L \in \Lambda(M)$, in [3] was defined the product

$$N_M L = \sum \{f(N) \mid f \in \text{Hom}_R(M, L)\}.$$

In general, this product is not associative but if M is projective in $\sigma[M]$ then it is. Therefore, if M is projective in $\sigma[M]$, then $\Lambda(M)$ is a quasi-quantale. In fact, for all subset $\{N_i\}_{\mathcal{J}}$,

$$\left(\sum_{\mathcal{J}} N_i \right)_M L = \sum_{\mathcal{J}} (N_i)_M L.$$

Let $\Lambda^{fi}(M) = \{N \leq M \mid N \text{ is fully invariant}\}$, that is, $f(N) \subseteq N$ for any endomorphism f of M . Notice that $\Lambda^{fi}(M)$ is a right-unital quasi-quantale, because $N_M M = N$ for all $N \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$. This example will be detailed in section 4.

- (6) Any quantale is a quasi-quantale.

- (7) The lattice of all preradical filters, denoted by $R\text{-fil}$ with the operation of Gabriel multiplication of preradical filters satisfies (LQ) and (RDQ), respectively. Therefore, $R\text{-fil}$, is a quasi-quantale which is not a quantale. See [7, 3.13 Proposition].

Proposition 3.3. *Let A be a quasi-quantale and $x, y, z \in A$. Then, the following conditions hold.*

- (1) *If $x \leq y$, then $zx \leq zy$ and $xz \leq yz$.*
- (2) *Moreover, if $1a \leq a$ for all $a \in A$, then*
 - (a) $xy \leq y \wedge x1$
 - (b) $x0 = 0$

Proof. (1) Notice that $\{x, y\} \subseteq A$ is a directed subset, so $zy = z(x \vee y) = zx \vee zy$. Thus $zx \leq zy$. Analogously, $yz = (x \vee y)z = xz \vee yz$. So $xz \leq yz$.

(2) (a) We have that $\{y, 1\}$ is directed, so $x1 = x(y \vee 1) = xy \vee x1$. Then $xy \leq x1$. On the other hand, $y \geq 1y = (x \vee 1)y = xy \vee 1y = xy \vee y$, then $xy \leq y$. Thus $xy \leq x1 \wedge y$.

(2)(b) By (1), it follows that $x0 \leq x1 \wedge 0 = 0$. □

Proposition 3.4. *Let A be a quasi-quantale. The following conditions hold.*

- (1) *If $x \leq y$ and $z \leq v$, then $xz \leq yv$.*
- (2) *$xy \vee xz \leq x(y \vee z)$ and $yx \vee zx \leq (y \vee z)x$, for all $x, y, z \in A$.*
- (3) *If $1a \leq a$ for all $a \in A$, then*
 - (a) $xx := x^2 \leq x1$ and $x^2 \leq x$, for every $x \in A$.
 - (b) $(x \wedge y)^2 \leq xy$ and $(x1 \wedge y)^2 \leq xy$.

Proof. (1) It follows from Proposition 3.3 (2) (a).

(2) Since $y \leq y \vee z$, then $xy \leq x(y \vee z)$. Similarly, $z \leq y \vee z$ implies that $xz \leq x(y \vee z)$. Therefore, $xy \vee xz \leq x(y \vee z)$.

(3) (a) It follows from Proposition 3.3 (2) (a).

(3) (b) Since $x \wedge y \leq x$ and $x \wedge y \leq y$, by (2), we conclude that $(x \wedge y)^2 \leq xy$. On the other hand, since $x1 \wedge y \leq x1$ and $x1 \wedge y \leq y$. By hypothesis, (1) and the associativity of the product, we conclude that $(x1 \wedge y)^2 \leq (x1)y = x(1y) \leq xy$. □

Proposition 3.5. *Let A be quasi-quantale. Consider the following statements.*

- (1) *$xy = 0$ if and only if $x1 \wedge y = 0$, for every $x, y \in A$.*
- (2) *If $x^2 = 0$, then $x = 0$, for every $x \in A$.*

Then, the condition (1) always implies (2). If in addition, A is a quasi-quantale which satisfies that $1a \leq a$ for all $a \in A$, the two conditions are equivalent.

Proof. First, we prove that (1) implies (2). Let $x \in A$ be such that $x^2 = 0$. Then, by (1) it follows that $x = x \wedge x = 0$.

Now, suppose that $1a \leq a$ for all $a \in A$. It remains to prove that (2) implies (1). Let $x, y \in A$ be such that $xy = 0$. Then, by Proposition 3.4 (3) (b), we have that $(x1 \wedge y)^2 \leq xy = 0$, so $(x1 \wedge y)^2 = 0$. Hence, $x1 \wedge y = 0$. Conversely, suppose that $x1 \wedge y = 0$. Then, it is immediately that $xy \leq x1 \wedge y = 0$. □

Recall that a lattice A is *pseudomultiplicative* if it has a binary product $(x, y) \mapsto xy$ which satisfies the following conditions for $x, y, z \in A$:

- (1) *If $x \leq y$ then $xz \leq yz$ and $zx \leq zy$.*

- (2) $xy \leq x \wedge y$.
- (3) $x(y \vee z) \leq xy \vee xz$.

See [9, Section 4] for more details.

From Proposition 3.3, it follows that a left-unital quasi-quantale (with $e = 1$) generalizes the concept of a pseudomultiplicative lattice. Even though let A be a bilateral quasi-quantale with $e = 1$, this one just will satisfy the above conditions (1) and (2). Indeed, a quasi-quantale, in general, does not hold the latter condition (3), see Proposition 3.4 (3) (b).

Lemma 3.6. *Let A be a quasi-quantale which satisfies the following identities:*

$$a(b \vee c) = ab \vee ac$$

$$(b \vee c)a = ba \vee ca$$

for all $a, b, c \in A$. Then A is a quantale.

Proof. Let $X \subseteq A$. Define $Y = \{x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_n \mid x_i \in X\}$. Then $X \subseteq Y$, so $\bigvee X \leq \bigvee Y$ and Y is a direct subset of A . Since A is quasi-quantale

$$a\left(\bigvee Y\right) = \bigvee \{ay \mid y \in Y\}.$$

Every $y \in Y$ is of the form $y = x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_n$ with $x_i \in X$. Since $x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_n \leq \bigvee X$ then

$$\bigvee \{ay \mid y \in Y\} \leq a\left(\bigvee X\right) \leq a\left(\bigvee Y\right),$$

so

$$a\left(\bigvee X\right) = \bigvee \{ay \mid y \in Y\}.$$

We have that $X \subseteq Y$, whence $\bigvee \{ax \mid x \in X\} \leq \bigvee \{ay \mid y \in Y\}$. On the other hand, by hypothesis

$$ay = a(x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_n) = ax_1 \vee \dots \vee ax_n \leq \bigvee \{ax \mid x \in X\},$$

thus $\bigvee \{ay \mid y \in Y\} \leq \bigvee \{ax \mid x \in X\}$. Hence

$$a\left(\bigvee X\right) = \bigvee \{ax \mid x \in X\}$$

□

Lemma 3.7. *Let $(A, \leq, \vee, 1)$ be a complete lattice. Then, A is meet-continuous if and only if A is a quasi-quantale such that*

- (a) *The binary operation in A is commutative.*
- (b) *A has an identity, $e = 1$*

Proof. First, suppose that A is a meet-continuous complete lattice. It is clear that A with the binary operation $\wedge$ is a quasi-quantale which satisfies (a) and (b).

Conversely, since A is commutative, it follows that $1a = a = a1$. This implies that $ab \leq a \wedge b$. Thus $ab = a \wedge b$. Therefore, A is meet-continuous. □

Definition 3.8. Let A be a quasi-quantale. Consider $s: A \rightarrow A$ a inflator on A . We say that:

- (1) s is *contextual stable* if $s(a)x \leq s(ax)$ and $y(s(a)) \leq s(ya)$ for all $a, x, y \in A$.
- (2) s is *pre-multiplicative* if $s(a) \wedge b \leq s(ab)$ for all $a, b \in A$.
- (3) s is *multiplicative* if $s(a) \wedge s(b) = s(ab)$ for all $a, b \in A$.

- (4) s is a *contextual pre-nucleus* if $s(a)s(b) \leq s(ab)$ for all $a, b \in A$.
- (5) s is a *contextual nucleus* if $s^2 = s$ and s is a contextual pre-nucleus.

Let A be a quasi-quantale and $j: A \rightarrow A$ a nucleus on A , we define a binary operation in A_j given by $a, b \in A_j$, $a \cdot b = j(ab)$.

Proposition 3.9. *Let A be a quasi-quantale and j be a contextual nucleus. Then $(A_j, \cdot)$ is a quasi-quantale. If A is a left-unital quasi-quantale with identity e then A_j is a left-unital quasi-quantale with identity $j(e)$.*

Proof. Let $a, b, c \in A_j$. Consider the following inequalities,

$$(1) \quad abc \leq j(ab)c \leq j(j(ab)c) = j(ab) \cdot c = (a \cdot b) \cdot c$$

$$(2) \quad j(ab)c = j(ab)j(c) \leq j(abc)$$

Using (2), we have

$$(3) \quad (a \cdot b) \cdot c = j(j(ab)c) \leq j^2(abc) = j(abc).$$

By (1), $j(abc) \leq (a \cdot b) \cdot c$, and by (3), we have the equality

$$(a \cdot b) \cdot c \leq j(abc) \leq (a \cdot b) \cdot c$$

Analogously, $a \cdot (b \cdot c) = j(abc)$. Then $a \cdot (b \cdot c) = (a \cdot b) \cdot c$.

Now, let $X \subseteq A_j$ be a directed subset and $a \in A_j$. Then,

$$a \cdot \left(\bigvee^j X \right) = j \left(a \bigvee^j X \right) = j \left(aj \left(\bigvee X \right) \right) \geq a \left(\bigvee X \right) = \bigvee \{ax \mid x \in X\}.$$

Notice that $j(ax) \leq j(\bigvee \{ax \mid x \in X\})$ for all $x \in X$, so

$$j \left(a \cdot \left(\bigvee^j X \right) \right) \geq j \left(\bigvee \{ax \mid x \in X\} \right) \geq \bigvee \{j(ax) \mid x \in X\}.$$

Since j is a nucleus,

$$a \cdot \left(\bigvee^j X \right) = j \left(a \cdot \left(\bigvee^j X \right) \right) \geq j \left(\bigvee \{j(ax) \mid x \in X\} \right) = \bigvee^j \{a \cdot x \mid x \in X\}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \bigvee^j \{a \cdot x \mid x \in X\} &= j \left(\bigvee \{j(ax) \mid x \in X\} \right) \geq j \left(\bigvee \{ax \mid x \in X\} \right) \\ &= j \left(a \bigvee X \right) \geq j(a)j \left(\bigvee X \right) = a \cdot \bigvee^j X \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$a \cdot \bigvee^j X \geq \bigvee^j \{ax \mid x \in X\} \geq a \cdot \bigvee^j X$$

Hence $(A_j, \cdot)$ is a quasi-quantale.

Now, suppose that A is a left-unital quasi-quantale. Let $a \in A_j$, then

$$a = ea \leq j(e)a \leq j(j(e)a) = j(j(e)j(a)) \leq j(ea) = j(a) = a.$$

So $a = j(j(e)a) = j(e) \cdot a$. Hence A_j is a left-unital quasi-quantale. $\square$

Proposition 3.10. *Let A be a quasi-quantale. Then, for each multiplicative nucleus d on A , the set A_d is a meet-continuous lattice.*

Proof. Let $X \subseteq A_d$ be a directed subset and $a \in A_d$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} d\left(\left(\bigvee X\right) \wedge a\right) &= d\left(\left(\bigvee X\right) a\right) = d\left(\bigvee\{xa \mid x \in X\}\right) \leq d\left(\bigvee\{d(xa) \mid x \in X\}\right) \\ &= d\left(\bigvee\{d(x) \wedge d(a) \mid x \in X\}\right) = d\left(\bigvee\{x \wedge a \mid x \in X\}\right) \leq d\left(\left(\bigvee X\right) \wedge a\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $d((\bigvee X) \wedge a) = d(\bigvee\{x \wedge a \mid x \in X\})$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\bigvee^d X\right) \wedge a &= d\left(\bigvee X\right) \wedge d(a) = d\left(\left(\bigvee X\right) \wedge a\right) \\ &= d\left(\bigvee\{x \wedge a \mid x \in X\}\right) = \bigvee^d\{x \wedge a \mid x \in X\}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 3.11. *Let A be a quasi-quantale. Suppose that for any $X \subseteq A$ and $a \in A$ is satisfied*

$$\left(\bigvee X\right) a = \bigvee\{xa \mid x \in X\}.$$

Then, for each multiplicative nucleus d on A , the set A_d is a frame.

Remark 3.12. In Corollary 3.11, if A is an idiom then A_j is an idiom.

Now, consider $p : A \rightarrow A$ an inflator on A such that

$$p(a)p(b) \leq p(ab) = p(a \wedge b) = p(a) \wedge p(b).$$

We call such p , *idiomatic pre-nucleus*, and denote by $IP(A)$ the set of idiomatic pre-nucleus.

Let $S \subseteq IP(A)$ be a directed subset. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} (\bigvee S)(a)(\bigvee S)(b) &= (\bigvee\{s(a) \mid s \in S\})(\bigvee\{s(b) \mid s \in S\}) \\ &= \bigvee\{s(a)s'(b) \mid s, s' \in S\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since S is directed, for $s, s' \in S$ there exists $f \in S$ such that $s, s' \leq f$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \bigvee\{s(a)s'(b) \mid s, s' \in S\} &\leq \bigvee\{f(a)f(b) \mid f \in S\} \\ &\leq \bigvee\{f(ab) \mid f \in S\} = \bigvee\{f(a \wedge b) \mid f \in S\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $(\bigvee S)(a)(\bigvee S)(b) \leq (\bigvee S)(ab) = (\bigvee S)(a \wedge b)$. Since the supremum of a directed set of pre-nucleus is a pre-nucleus, we obtain $\bigvee S \in IP(A)$.

Denote by $NI(A)$, the set of idiomatic nucleus.

Proposition 3.13. *Let A be a quasi-quantale. Then $NI(A)$ is a frame.*

Proof. Let $j \in NI(A)$ and k a inflator. Let $G = \{f \mid f \wedge k \leq j\}$. Let $f, g \in G$ and $p = fg$. For all $x \in A$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} k(x) \wedge p(x) &= k(x) \wedge f(g(x)) \leq f(k(x)) \wedge f(g(x)) \\ &= f(k(x) \wedge g(x)) \leq f(j(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} k(x) \wedge p(x) &\leq f(j(x)) \wedge k(x) \leq f(j(x)) \wedge k(j(x)) \\ &\leq (f \wedge k)(j(x)) \leq j(j(x)) = j(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, G is directed and whence $\bigvee G$ is idiomatic.

Let $h = \bigvee G$. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} j \circ (h \wedge k)(x) &= j(h(x) \wedge k(x)) = j(h(x)k(x)) = j\left(\left(\bigvee G\right)(x)k(x)\right) \\ &= j\left(\bigvee \{g(x)k(x) \mid g \in G\}\right) \leq j\left(\bigvee \{j(g(x)k(x)) \mid g \in G\}\right) \\ &\leq j\left(\bigvee \{j(g(x) \wedge k(x)) \mid g \in G\}\right) \leq j(j(j(x))) = j(x) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $j \circ (h \wedge k) = j$. Then $h \wedge k \leq j$, that is, $h \in G$. This implies that $h^2 = h$, and so $h \in NI(A)$.

Hence, $NI(A)$ has implication. Consequently, $NI(A)$ is a frame. $\square$

Definition 3.14. Let A be a quasi-quantale. An element $1 \neq p \in A$ is *prime* if whenever $ab \leq p$ then $a \leq p$ or $b \leq p$.

Definition 3.15. Let A be a quasi-quantale and B a sub $\bigvee$ -semilattice. We say that B is a *subquasi-quantale* of A if

$$\left(\bigvee X\right)a = \bigvee \{xa \mid x \in X\}$$

and

$$a\left(\bigvee Y\right) = \bigvee \{ay \mid y \in Y\},$$

for all directed subsets $X, Y \subseteq B$ and $a \in B$.

Definition 3.16. Let A be a quasi-quantale and B a subquasi-quantale of A . An element $1 \neq p \in A$ is a *prime element relative to B* if whenever $ab \leq p$ with $a, b \in B$ then $a \leq p$ or $b \leq p$.

It is clear that a prime element in A is a prime element relative to A .

We define the spectrum relative to B of A as

$$\text{Spec}_B(A) = \{p \in A \mid p \text{ is prime relative to } B\}$$

If $B = A$, then we just write $\text{Spec}(A)$.

Lemma 3.17. Let B be a subquasi-quantale of a quasi-quantale A . Suppose that $0, 1 \in B$ and $1b, b1 \leq b$ for all $b \in B$, then

- (1) $ab \leq a \wedge b$ for all $a, b \in B$.
- (2) Let $p \in A$ a prime element relative to B . If $a, b \in B$, then $ab \leq p$ if and only if $a \leq p$ or $b \leq p$.

Proof. (1). It follows by Proposition 3.3.(2).(a) that $ab \leq a \wedge 1b$. By hypothesis $1b \leq b$, so $ab \leq a \wedge b$.

(2). Let $a, b \in B$ and $p \in A$ a prime element relative to B . First, if $ab \leq p$, then, by definition, it follows that $a \leq p$ or $b \leq p$.

Conversely, suppose that $a \leq p$. By (1), $ab \leq a \wedge b \leq a$, then $ab \leq p$. Analogously if $b \leq p$. $\square$

From now on, let B be a subquasi-quantale of a quantale A and suppose that $0, 1 \in B$ and $1b, b1 \leq b$ for all $b \in B$.

Proposition 3.18. *Let B be a subquasi-quantale of a quasi-quantale A . Then $\text{Spec}_B(A)$ is a topological space, where the closed subsets are subsets given by*

$$\mathcal{V}(b) = \{p \in \text{Spec}_B(A) \mid b \leq p\},$$

with $b \in B$.

In dual form, the open subsets are of the form

$$\mathcal{U}(b) = \{p \in \text{Spec}_B(A) \mid b \not\leq p\},$$

with $b \in B$.

Proof. It clear that $\mathcal{U}(0) = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{U}(1) = \text{Spec}_B(A)$. Let $\{b_i\}_I$ be a family of elements in B . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}\left(\bigvee_I b_i\right) &= \left\{p \in \text{Spec}_B(A) \mid \bigvee_I b_i \not\leq p\right\} = \bigcup_I \{p \in \text{Spec}_B(A) \mid b_i \not\leq p\} \\ &= \bigcup_I \mathcal{U}(b_i) \end{aligned}$$

Now, let $a, b \in B$. Then, by Lemma 3.17.(2),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}(ab) &= \{p \in \text{Spec}_B(A) \mid ab \not\leq p\} = \{p \in \text{Spec}_B(A) \mid a \not\leq p \text{ and } b \not\leq p\} \\ &= (\{p \in \text{Spec}_B(A) \mid a \not\leq p\}) \cap (\{p' \in \text{Spec}_B(A) \mid b \not\leq p'\}) = \mathcal{U}(a) \cap \mathcal{U}(b). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Remark 3.19. Let $\mathcal{O}(\text{Spec}_B(A))$ be the frame of open subsets of $\text{Spec}_B(A)$. We have an adjunction of $\vee$ -morphisms

$$B \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{U}} \\ \xleftarrow{\mathcal{U}_*} \end{array} \mathcal{O}(\text{Spec}_B(A))$$

Where $\mathcal{U}_*$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{U}_*(W) = \bigvee \{b \in B \mid \mathcal{U}(b) \subseteq W\}$$

The composition $\mu = \mathcal{U}_* \circ \mathcal{U}$ is a closure operator in B .

Proposition 3.20. *Let $b \in B$. Then $\mu(b)$ is the largest element in B such that $\mu(b) \leq \bigwedge \{p \in \text{Spec}_B(A) \mid p \in \mathcal{V}(b)\}$.*

Proof. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(b) &= \mathcal{U}_*(\mathcal{U}(b)) = \bigvee \{c \in B \mid \mathcal{U}(c) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(b)\} \\ &= \bigvee \{c \in B \mid \mathcal{V}(b) \subseteq \mathcal{V}(c)\} \leq \bigwedge \{p \in \text{Spec}_B(A) \mid p \in \mathcal{V}(b)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $x \in B$ such that $x \leq p$ for all $p \in \mathcal{V}(b)$, then $\mathcal{V}(b) \subseteq \mathcal{V}(x)$. Thus, $x \leq \bigvee \{c \in A \mid \mathcal{V}(b) \subseteq \mathcal{V}(c)\}$, whence $x \leq \mu(b)$. $\square$

Theorem 3.21. *The closure operator in $\mu: B \rightarrow B$ is a multiplicative pre-nucleus.*

Proof. Let $a, b \in B$. By Lemma 3.17.(1), $ab \leq a \wedge b$. Thus $\mu(ab) \leq \mu(a) \wedge \mu(b)$. By Proposition 3.20,

$$\mu(a) \wedge \mu(b) \leq \left(\bigwedge \{q \in \text{Spec}_B(A) \mid q \in \mathcal{V}(a)\} \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge \{q' \in \text{Spec}_B(A) \mid q' \in \mathcal{V}(b)\} \right).$$

Let $p \in \text{Spec}_B(A)$ such that $ab \leq p$, then $a \leq p$ or $b \leq p$. If $a \leq p$ then,

$$\bigwedge \{q \in \text{Spec}_B(A) \mid q \in \mathcal{V}(a)\} \leq p.$$

Thus, $\mu(a) \wedge \mu(b) \leq p$. Analogously, if $b \leq p$ then $\mu(a) \wedge \mu(b) \leq p$. Hence

$$\mu(a) \wedge \mu(b) \leq \bigwedge \{p \in \text{Spec}_B(A) \mid p \in \mathcal{V}(ab)\}$$

By Proposition 3.20, $\mu(ab)$ is the largest element in B less or equal than $\bigwedge \{p \in \text{Spec}_B(A) \mid p \in \mathcal{V}(ab)\}$, therefore $\mu(a) \wedge \mu(b) \leq \mu(ab)$. Thus μ is multiplicative.

Now, since $ab \leq a \wedge b$ then $\mu(a) \wedge \mu(b) = \mu(ab) \leq \mu(a \wedge b)$. The other inequality always holds. Thus μ is a pre-nucleus. $\square$

Corollary 3.22. *A_μ is an meet-continuous lattice.*

Proof. It follows by Proposition 3.10. $\square$

4. THE LARGE SPECTRUM

In this section, we introduce a new spectrum for a module and we give some characterizations of modules with this space.

Firstly, recall that for any left R -module M , in [3, Lemma 2.1] was defined the product of submodules $N, L \in \Lambda(M)$,

$$N_M L := \sum \{f(N) \mid f \in \text{Hom}_R(M, L)\}.$$

Remark 4.1. [4, Proposition 1.3] This product satisfies the following properties for every submodules $K, K' \in \Lambda(M)$:

- (1) If $K \subseteq K'$ then $K_M X \subseteq K'_M X$ for every module X .
- (2) If X is a left module and $Y \subseteq X$ then $K_M Y \subseteq K_M X$.
- (3) $M_M X \subseteq X$ for every module X .
- (4) $K_M X = 0$ if and only if $f(K) = 0$ for all $f \in \text{Hom}(M, X)$.
- (5) $0_M X = 0$, for every module X .
- (6) Let $\{X_i \mid i \in I\}$ be a family of submodules of M then $\sum_{i \in I} (K_M X_i) \subseteq K_M (\sum_{i \in I} X_i)$.
- (7) $(\sum_{i \in I} K_i)_M N = \sum_{i \in I} K_{iM} N$ for every family of submodules $\{K_i \mid i \in I\}$ of M .

Proof. The proof of this is in [4, Proposition 1.3]. Here we only give the proof of (6) and (7).

(6) Let $\{X_i \mid i \in I\}$ be a family of submodules of M . Since $X_i \leq \sum_{i \in I} X_i$, by (2) of this proposition $(K_M X_i) \subseteq K_M (\sum_{i \in I} X_i)$. Thus,

$$\sum_{i \in I} (K_M X_i) \subseteq K_M \left(\sum_{i \in I} X_i \right).$$

(7) Let $\{K_i \mid i \in I\}$ be a family the submodules of M . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{i \in I} K_i \right)_M N &= \sum \left\{ \left(\sum_{i \in I} K_i \right) \mid f \in \text{Hom}_R(M, N) \right\} \\ &= \sum \left\{ \sum_{i \in I} f(K_i) \mid f \in \text{Hom}_R(M, N) \right\} = \sum_{i \in I} \sum \{f(K_i) \mid f \in \text{Hom}_R(M, N)\} \\ &= \sum_{i \in I} (K_i M N). \end{aligned}$$

□

Now, recall that an R -module N is said to be subgenerated by M if N is isomorphic to a submodule of an M -generated module. It is denoted by $\sigma[M]$ the full subcategory of $R\text{-Mod}$ whose objects are all R -modules subgenerated by M . Also, a module N is called a subgenerator in $\sigma[M]$ if $\sigma[M] = \sigma[N]$. In particular, M is a subgenerator in $R\text{-Mod}$ if $\sigma[M] = R\text{-Mod}$. See [23, §15] for more details.

Remember that $N \leq M$ is a fully invariant submodule of M if $f(N) \leq N$ for all f endomorphism of M . The set of fully invariant submodules of M is denoted by $\Lambda^{fi}(M)$.

Remark 4.2. Let $M \in R\text{-Mod}$ and projective in $\sigma[M]$. The following conditions hold.

- (1) The product $-_M - : \Lambda(M) \times \Lambda(M) \rightarrow \Lambda(M)$ is associative.
- (2) $K_M (\sum_{i \in I} X_i) = \sum_i (K_M X_i)$ for every directed family of submodules $\{X_i \mid i \in I\}$ of M .
- (3) If $N, L \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$, then $N_M L \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$ and hence the product $-_M -$ is well restricted in $\Lambda^{fi}(M)$.

Proof. (1) It follows by [2, Proposition 5.6].

(2) Let $\{X_i \mid i \in I\}$ be a directed family of submodules of M . Let $\sum_{j \in J} f_j(k_j) \in K_M (\sum_{i \in I} X_i)$, with $f_j : M \rightarrow \sum_{i \in I} X_i$. Since M is projective in $\sigma[M]$ for each f_j there exists $g_{i_j} : M \rightarrow X_{i_j}$ such that $\sum_{i \in I} g_{i_j}(k_j) = f_j(k_j)$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & M & \\ \oplus g_{i_j} \swarrow & \downarrow f_j & \\ \oplus_{i \in I} X_i & \twoheadrightarrow & \sum_{i \in I} X_i \end{array}$$

Then

$$\sum_{j \in J} f_j(k_j) = \sum_{j \in J} \sum_{i \in I} g_{ij}(k_j) \in \sum X_{i_j}.$$

Since this sum is finite and $\{X_i | i \in I\}$ is directed, there exists $l \in I$ such that $\sum X_{i_j} \subseteq X_l$. Thus

$$\sum_{j \in J} f_j(k_j) = \sum_{j \in J} \sum_{i \in I} g_{ij}(k_j) \in K_M X_l \subseteq \sum_{i \in I} (K_M X_i)$$

The other contention follows by 4.1.(6).

(3) Let $N, L \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$ and $g : M \rightarrow M$. Then

$$g(N_M L) = g\left(\sum \{f(N) | f \in \text{Hom}_R(M, L)\}\right) = \sum \{gf(N) | f \in \text{Hom}_R(M, L)\}$$

Since $L \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$, $gf \in \text{Hom}_R(M, L)$. Hence

$$g(N_M L) \subseteq N_M L.$$

□

Notice that in Remark 4.2 (1), the projectivity condition for M is necessary as is shown in the following example which was taken from [3, Lemma 2.1 (vi)]: consider $\mathbb{Z}$ the additive group of integers and $\mathbb{Q}$ the additive group of rational numbers, then $0 = (\mathbb{Z} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{Z}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{Q} \neq \mathbb{Z} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} (\mathbb{Z} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{Q}) = \mathbb{Q}$.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $M \in R\text{-Mod}$. If M is projective in $\sigma[M]$, the following conditions hold.*

- (1) $\Lambda(M)$ is a quasi-quantale. In fact, for all subset $\{N_i\}_{i \in I}$, $(\sum_{i \in I} N_i)_M L = \sum_{i \in I} (N_i)_M L$.
- (2) $\Lambda^{fi}(M)$ is a right-unital subquasi-quantale of $\Lambda(M)$.

Proof. (1) By Remark 4.2 (1), the product $-_M - : \Lambda(M) \times \Lambda(M) \rightarrow \Lambda(M)$ is associative, and by Remark 4.1 (7) and Remark 4.2 (2), $\Lambda(M)$ is a quasi-quantale.

(2) Since the product $-_M -$ is well restricted in $\Lambda^{fi}(M)$, then $\Lambda^{fi}(M)$ is a subquasi-quantale. Now, if $N \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$ then

$$N_M M = \sum \{f(N) | f \in \text{Hom}_R(M, M)\} \subseteq N,$$

but $N = Id_M(N) \leq N_M M$. Hence $N_M M = N$. Thus $\Lambda^{fi}(M)$ is a right-unital quasi-quantale. □

In this study, we also have preradicals theory. Recall that a *preradical* r on $R\text{-Mod}$ is a subfunctor of the identity functor on $R\text{-Mod}$, i.e. r assigns to each M a submodule $r(M)$ in such a way that every $f \in \text{Hom}_R(M, N)$ restricts to a homomorphism $r(f) \in \text{Hom}_R(r(M), r(N))$. In particular, $r(R)$ is a two-sided ideal. The big lattice of preradicals in $R\text{-Mod}$ is denoted by $R\text{-pr}$. In fact, $R\text{-pr}$ is a left -unital quasi-quantale with the product $\wedge$, as was mentioned in Example 3.2 (3).

Let $M \in R\text{-Mod}$. For each $N \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$, there are two distinguished preradicals, α_N^M and ω_N^M , which are defined as follow

$$\alpha_N^M(L) := \sum \{f(N) | f \in \text{Hom}_R(M, L)\}$$

and

$$\omega_N^M(L) := \bigcap \{f^{-1}(N) \mid f \in \text{Hom}_R(L, M)\},$$

for each $L \in R\text{-Mod}$.

Remark 4.4. [12, Proposition 5]. If N is a fully invariant submodule of M , then the following conditions are satisfied.

- (1) The preradicals α_N^M and ω_N^M have the property that $\alpha_N^M(M) = N$ and $\omega_N^M(M) = N$ respectively.
- (2) The class $\{r \in R\text{-pr} \mid r(M) = N\}$ is precisely the interval $[\alpha_N^M, \omega_N^M]$.

The reader can find more properties of these preradicals in [12], [13], [14] and [15, Proposition 1.3].

Definition 4.5. Let $M, P \in R\text{-Mod}$ such that $P \leq M$. Define

$$\eta_P^M : R\text{-Mod} \rightarrow R\text{-Mod}$$

$$\eta_P^M(L) := \bigcap \{f^{-1}(P) \in R\text{-Mod} \mid f \in \text{Hom}_R(L, M)\},$$

for each $L \in R\text{-Mod}$.

It is clear that η_P^M is a preradical. Also, it is clear that $\eta_P^M(M) \leq P$. When $P \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$, it follows that $P = \eta_P^M(M)$. And in this case, $\omega_P^M = \eta_P^M$.

- Remark 4.6.**
- (1) $\eta_P^M \preceq \omega_{\eta_P^M(M)}^M$
 - (2) If $N, L \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$ and $N_M L \leq P$, then $\omega_{(N_M L)}^M \preceq \eta_P^M$.

Remark 4.7. Let $M \in R\text{-Mod}$.

- (1) If $P, Q \leq M$ satisfy that $P \leq Q$, then $\eta_P^M \preceq \eta_Q^M$.
- (2) If $r \in R\text{-pr}$ and $P \leq M$ satisfy that $r(M) \leq \eta_P^M(M)$, then

$$r \preceq \omega_{r(M)}^M \preceq \eta_P^M \preceq \omega_{\eta_P^M(M)}^M.$$

Remark 4.8. Let M be an R -module. We can consider $\text{Spec}(\Lambda^{fi}(M))$. Notice that the prime submodules defined in [13] are the elements in $\text{Spec}(\Lambda^{fi}(M))$.

Proposition 4.9. Let $M \in R\text{-Mod}$ and $P \leq M$. If η_P^M is a prime preradical i.e. $\eta_P^M \in \text{Spec}(R\text{-pr})$ and $\eta_P^M(M) \neq M$, then $\eta_P^M(M) \in \text{Spec}(\Lambda^{fi}(M))$. Moreover, $\eta_P^M(M)$ is the largest element in $\text{Spec}(\Lambda^{fi}(M))$ which is contained in P .

Proof. Let $N, L \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$ such that $N_M L \leq \eta_P^M(M)$. This is, $(\alpha_N^M \cdot \alpha_L^M)(M) \leq \eta_P^M(M)$. By Remark 4.7(1) it follows that $\alpha_N^M \cdot \alpha_L^M \preceq \eta_P^M$. Since η_P^M is a prime preradical, we get $\alpha_N^M \preceq \eta_P^M$ or $\alpha_L^M \preceq \eta_P^M$. Thus, $N \leq \eta_P^M(M)$ or $L \leq \eta_P^M(M)$. Therefore, $\eta_P^M(M) \in \text{Spec}(\Lambda^{fi}(M))$.

Finally, let $K \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$ be a prime submodule of M such that $K \leq P$. Then, $\omega_K^M \preceq \eta_P^M$. Thus, applying M in the last inequality we obtain $K = \omega_K^M(M) \leq \eta_P^M(M) \leq P$. $\square$

From now on, M will be assumed projective on $\sigma[M]$, in order to have that $\Lambda^{fi}(M)$ is a right-unital subquasi-quantale of $\Lambda(M)$.

Let M be an R -module. If P is a prime element of $\Lambda(M)$ relative to $\Lambda^{fi}(M)$, then we will call it a *large prime submodule* of M . We will write $LgSpec(M)$ instead of $Spec_{\Lambda^{fi}(M)}(\Lambda(M))$.

Proposition 4.10. *Let $M, P \in R\text{-Mod}$ such that $P \leq M$. Then, the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (1) P is a large prime submodule of M .
- (2) η_P^M is a prime preradical.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) From the hypothesis, it is clear that $P \neq M$. So, $\eta_P^M \neq \underline{1}$. Let $r, s \in R\text{-pr}$ such that $r \cdot s \leq \eta_P^M$. Evaluating this in M and using [13, Proposition 14 (2)], we obtain $r(M)_M s(M) \leq \eta_P^M(M)$. Thus, $r(M)_M s(M) \leq \eta_P^M(M) \leq P$, so, by hypothesis, it follows that $r(M) \leq P$ or $s(M) \leq P$. And by Proposition 4.9, $\eta_P^M(M)$ is the largest fully invariant submodule of M which is contained in P . Hence, $r(M) \leq \eta_P^M(M)$ or $s(M) \leq \eta_P^M(M)$. Consequently, $r \leq \eta_P^M$ or $s \leq \eta_P^M$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) By hypothesis, η_P^M is a prime preradical, so in particular $P \not\leq M$. Let $N, L \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$ such that $N_M L = \alpha_N^M(L) \leq P$. Notice that $N_M L = \alpha_N^M(L) = (\alpha_N^M \cdot \alpha_L^M)(M)$. Then, $\alpha_N^M \cdot \alpha_L^M \leq \omega_{N_M L}^M$. Thus, by Remark 4.7 (2) we get $\alpha_N^M \cdot \alpha_L^M \leq \eta_P^M$. Since η_P^M is prime, then $\alpha_N^M \leq \eta_P^M$ or $\alpha_L^M \leq \eta_P^M$. Applying M we obtain $N = \alpha_N^M(M) \leq \eta_P^M(M) \leq P$ or $L = \alpha_L^M(M) \leq \eta_P^M(M) \leq P$. By Remark 4.7 (2), we conclude that $r \leq \eta_P^M$ or $s \leq \eta_P^M$. Hence, η_P^M is a prime preradical. $\square$

Corollary 4.11. *Let $M \in R\text{-Mod}$ and $P \leq M$. If P is a large prime submodule of M , then $\eta_P^M(M)$ is the largest element in $Spec(\Lambda^{fi}(M))$ which is contained in P .*

Proof. It follows from Propositions 4.9 and 4.10. $\square$

Definition 4.12. Following [13], an R -module M is a *prime module* if

$$0 \in Spec(\Lambda^{fi}(M)).$$

Corollary 4.13. *Let $M \in R\text{-Mod}$ and $P \leq M$. Then, the following conditions hold.*

- (1) *If P is a large prime submodule of M , then $M/\eta_P^M(M)$ is a prime module.*
- (2) *If M is a quasi-projective module and M/P is a prime module, then P is a large prime submodule.*

Proof. (1) It is a consequence from Corollary 4.11 and [13, Proposition 18.1].

(2) Note that in [13, Proposition 18.2] is not necessary the hypothesis of $P \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$. $\square$

Example 4.14. If $\mathcal{M} < M$ is a maximal submodule then $M/\mathcal{M}$ is a simple module, hence it is a prime module. Therefore, every maximal submodule of M is a large prime submodule.

Definition 4.15. An R -module M is *FI-simple* if the only fully invariant submodules of M are 0 and M .

Proposition 4.16. *If M is an FI-simple module, then M is cogenerated by all its non-zero factors modules.*

Proof. If M is FI-simple, it is clear that $LgSpec(M) = \{N \leq M \mid N \neq M\}$ and $Spec(\Lambda^{fi}(M)) = 0$. By corollary 4.11, $\eta_N^M(M) = 0$ for all $N \leq M$, with $N \neq M$. This implies that there exists a monomorphism $M \rightarrow (M/N)^S$, where $S = End_R(M)$ for all proper submodule of M . $\square$

Remark 4.17. In [1] the author writes $Spec^{fp}(M)$ instead of $Spec(\Lambda^{fi}(M))$. If M is projective in $\sigma[M]$ then $LgSpec(M)$ is a topological space by Proposition 3.18 and Corollary 4.13. We can see that $Spec(\Lambda^{fi}(M))$ is a subspace of $LgSpec(M)$. Recall that an R -module is *duo* if $\Lambda(M) = \Lambda^{fi}(M)$. Note that if M is a duo module then $Spec(\Lambda^{fi}(M)) = LgSpec(M) = Spec(\Lambda(M))$. We will call $LgSpec(M)$ the *large spectrum* of M .

Definition 4.18. A module M is *coatomic* if every submodule is contained in a maximal submodule of M .

Example 4.19.

- (1) Every finitely generated and every semisimple module is coatomic.
- (2) Semiperfect modules are coatomic.
- (3) If R is a left perfect ring every left R -module is coatomic. (see [8])

Note that in general, it could be that $LgSpec(M) = \emptyset$. If we assume that M is a coatomic module then $LgSpec(M)$ is not the empty set.

We will denote $Spec(\Lambda(M))$ just by $Spec(M)$.

Proposition 4.20. *Let M be quasi-projective. Then $Spec(\Lambda^{fi}(M))$ is a dense subspace of $LgSpec(M)$*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{U}(N) \neq \emptyset$ be an open set of $LgSpec(M)$ such that

$$\mathcal{U}(N) \cap Spec(\Lambda^{fi}(M)) = \emptyset.$$

Thus, the elements of $\mathcal{U}(N)$ are not fully invariant. Let $P \in \mathcal{U}(N)$. By Corollary 4.11, there exists $Q \in Spec(\Lambda^{fi}(M))$ such that $Q \subseteq P$, which is a contradiction. Thus $\mathcal{U}(N) = \emptyset$. So, $Spec(\Lambda^{fi}(M))$ is dense in $LgSpec(M)$. $\square$

Let $\mathcal{O}(LgSpec(M))$ be the frame of open subsets of $LgSpec(M)$. Then we have a morphism of $\vee$ -semilattices

$$\mathcal{U}: \Lambda^{fi}(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(LgSpec(M))$$

given by $\mathcal{U}(N) = \{P \in LgSpec(M) \mid N \not\subseteq P\}$.

This morphism has a right adjunct $\mathcal{U}_*: \mathcal{O}(LgSpec(M)) \rightarrow \Lambda^{fi}(M)$ given by

$$\mathcal{U}_*(A) = \sum \{K \in \Lambda^{fi}(M) \mid \mathcal{U}(K) \subseteq A\}.$$

Proposition 4.21. *Let $N \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$. Then $(\mathcal{U}_* \circ \mathcal{U})(N)$ is the largest fully invariant submodule of M contained in $\bigcap_{P \in \mathcal{V}(N)} P$.*

Proof. It follows by Proposition 3.20. $\square$

Definition 4.22. Let M be an R -module and $M \neq N \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$. We say that N is *semiprime* in M if whenever $K_M K \leq N$ with $K \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$ then $K \leq N$. We say that M is a *semiprime* module if 0 is semiprime.

Remark 4.23. The last definition is given in [14]. Note that if $\{P_i\}_I$ is a family of large primes submodules of M , then $\bigcap_I P_i$ is not necessary a fully invariant submodule of M but $\bigcap_I P_i$ satisfies the property that for every $L \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$ such that $L_M L \leq \bigcap_I P_i$ then $L \leq \bigcap_I P_i$.

Proposition 4.24. Let $\mu = \mathcal{U}_* \circ \mathcal{U}$ be as in Proposition 4.21. Let $N \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$ then, $\mu(N) = N$ if and only if N is semiprime in M or $N = M$.

Proof. Assume that $\mu(N) = N$ and let $L \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$ such that $L_M L \leq N$. We have that $\mu(N) \leq \bigcap_{P \in \mathcal{V}(N)} P$, so $L_M L \leq \bigcap_{P \in \mathcal{V}(N)} P$. By Remark 4.23, $L \leq$

$\bigcap_{P \in \mathcal{V}(N)} P$. Since L is a fully invariant submodule of M , by Proposition 4.21 $L \leq \mu(N)$. Thus $\mu(N)$ is semiprime in M .

Now suppose that N is semiprime in M . By [6, Proposition 1.12],

$$N = \bigcap \{Q \mid N \leq Q, Q \in \text{Spec}(\Lambda^{fi}(M))\}.$$

Since $\text{Spec}(\Lambda^{fi}(M)) \subseteq \text{LgSpec}(M)$, then

$$\bigcap_{P \in \mathcal{V}(N)} P \subseteq \bigcap \{Q \in \text{Spec}(\Lambda^{fi}(M)) \mid N \leq Q\} = N.$$

This implies that $N = \mu(N)$. □

Corollary 4.25. The closure operator $\mu: \Lambda^{fi}(M) \rightarrow \Lambda^{fi}(M)$ is a multiplicative pre-nucleus.

Proof. By Theorem 3.21. □

Remark 4.26. By definition μ is a closure operator and by Corollary 4.25 μ is a pre-nucleus then μ is a nucleus in $\Lambda^{fi}(M)$.

Proposition 4.27. Let $M \in R\text{-Mod}$ and

$$SP(M) = \{N \in \Lambda^{fi}(M) \mid N \text{ is semiprime}\} \cup \{M\}.$$

Then $SP(M)$ is a frame. Moreover, $SP(M) \cong \mathcal{O}(\text{LgSpec}(M))$ canonically as frames.

Proof. By Proposition 4.24, $\Lambda^{fi}(M)_\mu = SP(M)$. Since μ is a multiplicative nucleus then $SP(M)$ is a frame by Corollary 3.11. □

Definition 4.28. Let L be a lattice. An element $1 \neq p \in L$ is called $\wedge$ -irreducible if whenever $x \wedge y \leq p$ for any $x, y \in L$ then $x \leq p$ or $y \leq p$.

Given a frame F , its points is the set

$$pt(F) = \{p \in F \mid p \text{ is } \wedge\text{-irreducible}\}$$

Proposition 4.29. *Let M be an R -module. Then $pt(SP(M)) = Spec(\Lambda^{fi}(M))$*

Proof. It is clear that $Spec(\Lambda^{fi}(M)) \subseteq pt(SP(M))$. Now, let $P \in pt(SP(M))$ and $N, L \in \Lambda^{fi}(M)$ such that $N_M L \leq P$. By Proposition 4.25,

$$\mu(N) \cap \mu(L) = \mu(N \cap L) = \mu(N_M L) \leq \mu(P) = P.$$

Since $\mu(N), \mu(L) \in SP(M)$ then $N \leq \mu(N) \leq P$ or $L \leq \mu(L) \leq P$. $\square$

Remark 4.30. Since $pt(SP(M)) = Spec(\Lambda^{fi}(M))$, there exists a continuous function

$$\eta: LgSpec(M) \rightarrow Spec(\Lambda^{fi}(M))$$

defined as $\eta(P) = \sum_{SP} \{N \in SP(M) \mid P \in \mathcal{V}(N)\}$, where $\sum_{SP}$ denotes the suprema in the frame $SP(M)$. Also, we have a frame isomorphism between $SP(M)$ and $\mathcal{O}(Spec(\Lambda^{fi}(M)))$. See [21]

Definition 4.31. Let F be a frame. It is said that F is *spatial* if it is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}(X)$ for some topological space X . If each quotient frame of F is spatial, it is said that F is *totally spatial*.

Theorem 4.32. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$. Suppose for every fully invariant submodule $N \leq M$, the factor module M/N has finite uniform dimension. Then, the frame $SP(M)$ is totally spatial.*

Proof. Let $N \in SP(M)$. By [22, Lemma 9] M/N is projective in $\sigma[M/N]$. Since N is semiprime in M then M/N is a semiprime module (Definition 4.22) by [14, Proposition 13]. By hypothesis M/N has finite uniform dimension, so by [6, Proposition 1.29] $Spec(\Lambda^{fi}(M/N))$ has finitely many minimal elements $(P_1/N), \dots, (P_n/N)$ such that $0 = P_1/N \cap \dots \cap P_n/N$.

Since $P_i/N \in Spec(\Lambda^{fi}(M/N))$ then $M/P_i \cong \frac{M/N}{P_i/N}$ is a prime module. Thus, by [13, Proposition 18], $P_i \in Spec(\Lambda^{fi}(M))$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Moreover, $N = P_1 \cap \dots \cap P_n$. Because of this intersection is finite, we can assume that it is irredundant. Thus by [10, Theorem 3.4], $SP(M)$ is totally spatial. $\square$

For the definition of a *weakly scattered space*, see [21] and [11, 8.1].

Corollary 4.33. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$. Suppose for every fully invariant submodule $N \leq M$, the factor module M/N has finite uniform dimension. Then the topological space $LgSpec(M)$ is weakly scattered.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.27 $SP(M) \cong \mathcal{O}(LgSpec(M))$, then $LgSpec(M)$ is weakly scattered by [10, Corollary 3.7]. $\square$

For the definition of Krull dimension of a module M see [5].

Corollary 4.34. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$. If M has Krull dimension, then $LgSpec(M)$ is weakly scattered.*

Proof. If M has Krull dimension then every factor module M/N so does. Now, if M/N has Krull dimension, by [5, Proposition 2.9] M/N has finite uniform dimension. So by Corollary 4.33 $LgSpec(M)$ is weakly scattered. $\square$

Remark 4.35. Note that with the last corollary, for every commutative ring R with Krull dimension, $\text{Spec}(R)$ is weakly scattered. In particular, for every noetherian commutative ring. Also see [10, Theorem 4.1].

Remark 4.36. In [21, Theorem 7.5], for a T_0 space S , the frame of all nuclei over the topology of S is boolean precisely when S is scattered, so by 4.33, we observe that $N\mathcal{O}(\text{LgSpec}(M)) \cong NSP(M)$ is boolean.

If R is a ring, the lowest radical of R is defined as

$$\text{Nil}_*(R) = \bigcap \{P \mid P \in \text{Spec}(\text{Bil}(R))\}.$$

It is well known that $\text{Nil}_*(R)$ is contained in $\text{Rad}(R)$.

Definition 4.37. Let $M \in R\text{-Mod}$. The lowest radical of M is the fully invariant submodule

$$\text{Nil}_*(M) = \bigcap \{Q \mid Q \in \text{Spec}(\Lambda^{fi}(M))\}.$$

Proposition 4.38. $\text{Nil}_*(M) \leq \text{Rad}(M)$.

Proof. Since every maximal submodule is a large prime submodule by Remark 4.23, $\text{Rad}(M)$ is semiprime in M . So $\text{Rad}(M)$ is an intersection of elements of $\text{Spec}(\Lambda^{fi}(M))$ by [6, Proposition 1.12]. This implies that $\text{Nil}_*(M) \leq \text{Rad}(M)$. $\square$

If

$$\text{Max}(M) = \{\mathcal{M} < M \mid \mathcal{M} \text{ is a maximal submodule}\},$$

we have that $\text{Max}(M) \subseteq \text{LgSpec}(M)$. Notice that $\text{Max}(M)$ is a subspace of $\text{LgSpec}(M)$.

Suppose that M is coatomic. Then we have the adjunction

$$\Lambda^{fi}(M) \begin{matrix} \xrightarrow{m} \\ \xleftarrow{m_*} \end{matrix} \mathcal{O}(\text{Max}(M))$$

defined as

$$m(N) = \{\mathcal{M} \in \text{Max}(M) \mid N \not\subseteq \mathcal{M}\},$$

and

$$m_*(A) = \sum \{K \in \Lambda^{fi}(M) \mid m(K) \subseteq A\}.$$

This adjunction can be factorized as

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Lambda^{fi}(M) & \begin{matrix} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{U}} \\ \xleftarrow{\mathcal{U}_*} \end{matrix} & \mathcal{O}(\text{LgSpec}(M)) \\ & \begin{matrix} \searrow m \\ \swarrow m_* \end{matrix} & \downarrow \begin{matrix} I_* \\ I \end{matrix} \\ & & \mathcal{O}(\text{Max}(M)) \end{array}$$

where $I: \mathcal{O}(\text{LgSpec}(M)) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\text{Max}(M))$ is given by $I(A) = A \cap \text{Max}(M)$.

Following the proof of Proposition 3.20, $(m_* \circ m)(N)$ is the largest fully invariant submodule contained in

$$\bigcap_{\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{V}(N) \cap \text{Max}(M)} \mathcal{M}$$

Then

$$(m_* \circ m)(0) = \bigcap_{\mathcal{M} \in \text{Max}(M)} \mathcal{M} = \text{Rad}(M)$$

Note that the proof of Theorem 3.21 can be applied to $\tau := m_* \circ m$, so τ is a multiplicative nucleus. Hence $R(M) := \Lambda^{fi}(M)_\tau$ is a frame by Corollary 3.11. Moreover, $R(M)$ is a subframe of $SP(M)$.

Definition 4.39. Let M be an R -module. M is *co-semisimple* if every simple module in $\sigma[M]$ is M -injective.

If $M = {}_R R$, this is the definition of a *left V-ring*.

The following characterization of co-semisimple modules is given in [23, 23.1]

Proposition 4.40. For an R -module M the following statements are equivalent:

- (1) M is co-semisimple.
- (2) Any proper submodule of M is an intersection of maximal submodules.

Corollary 4.41. Let M be a co-semisimple module. Then $\Lambda^{fi}(M)$ is a frame.

Proof. Since M is co-semisimple then $SP(M) = \Lambda^{fi}(M)$. □

Corollary 4.42. Let M be a duo co-semisimple module then $\Lambda(M)$ is a frame.

Proof. In this case $\Lambda(M) = \Lambda^{fi}(M)$. □

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to thank Professor Harold Simmons for sharing [17] which inspired the topics in this paper. Finally, the authors are grateful for the referee's many valuable comments and helpful suggestions which have improved this one.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abuhlail, J. *A Zariski topology for modules*. Communications in Algebra, 39 (2011): 4163-4182.
- [2] Beachy, J. *M-injective modules and prime M-ideals*. Communications in Algebra, 30(10), 4639-4676 (2002).
- [3] Bican, L., Jambor P., Kepka T., Nĕmec P. *Prime and coprime modules*. Fundamenta Mathematicae, 107:33-44 (1980).
- [4] Pérez, J. C., & Montes, J. R. (2012). *Prime Submodules and Local Gabriel Correspondence in $\sigma[M]$* . Communications in Algebra, 40(1), 213-232.
- [5] Castro, J., Ríos, J. *Krull dimension and classical Krull dimension of modules*. Communications in Algebra, 42:7, 3183-3204 (2014).
- [6] Castro, J., Medina, M., Ríos, J., Zaldívar, A. *On semiprime Goldie Modules*, submitted.
- [7] Golan J. *Linear topologies on a ring: an overview*, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series 159, Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow, 1987, John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York.
- [8] Güngöroğlu, C. *Coatomic Modules*. Far East J. Math. Sci. Special Volume, Part II (1998): 153-162.
- [9] López, A.F., Tocón Barroso, M.I. *Pseudocomplemented Semilattices, Boolean Algebras, and Compatible Products* Journal of Algebra 242, 60-91 (2001).

- [10] Niefeld, S. B., Rosenthal K. I. *Spatial sublocales and essential primes*. Topology and its Applications 26.3 (1987): 263-269.
- [11] Picado, J., A. Pultr. *Frames and locales: Topology with our points*, Springer Science & Business Media (Frontiers in Mathematics), 2012.
- [12] Raggi F., Ríos J., Fernández-Alonso R., Rincón H., Signoret C. *The lattice structure of preradicals*. Communications in Algebra, 30(3): 533-1544, (2002).
- [13] Raggi F., Ríos J., Fernández-Alonso R., Rincón H., Signoret C. *Prime and irreducible preradicals*. Journal of Algebra and its Applications 4.04 (2005): 451-466.
- [14] Raggi F., Ríos J., Fernández-Alonso R., Rincón H., Signoret C. *Semiprime preradicals*. Communications in Algebra, 37(8): 2811-2822, (2009).
- [15] Raggi F., Ríos J., Rincón H., Fernández-Alonso R. *Basic preradicals and main injective modules*. Journal of Algebra and Its Applications. Vol. 8, No. 1 (2009) 1-16.
- [16] Rosenthal K. I. *Quantales and Their Applications*. Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, Longman Higher Education (1990).
- [17] Simmons, H. "Two sided multiplicative lattices and ring radicals." preprint.
- [18] Simmons, Harold. *An algebraic version of Cantor-Bendixson analysis*. Categorical Aspects of Topology and Analysis. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1982. 310-323.
- [19] Simmons, H. *A collection of notes on frames*. <http://www.cs.man.ac.uk/~hsimmons/FRAMES/frames>
- [20] Simmons, H. *An introduction to idioms*. Notes. <http://www.cs.man.ac.uk/~hsimmons/00-IDSandMODS/EARLIER>
- [21] Simmons, Harold. *The fundamental triangle of a space*. <http://www.cs.man.ac.uk/~hsimmons/FRAMES/D-FUNDTRIANGLE.pdf> (2006).
- [22] van der Berg, J., Wisbauer, R. *Modules whose hereditary pretorsion classes are closed under products*. Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra 209(1): 215-221, (2007).
- [23] Wisbauer R. *Foundations of Module and Ring Theory*. 1991. <http://www.math.uni-duesseldorf.de/~wisbauer/book.pdf>

MAURICIO MEDINA BÁRCENAS^(*), ANGEL ZALDÍVAR CORICHI[†].
 Instituto de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, área de Investigación Científica,
 Circuito Exterior, C.U., 04510, México, D.F., México.

MARTHA LIZBETH SHAID SANDOVAL MIRANDA^(‡).
 Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
 Circuito Exterior, Ciudad Universitaria, 04510, México, D.F., México.

e-mails: (*) mmedina@matem.unam.mx corresponding author

(†) zaldivar@matem.unam.mx

(‡) marlisha@ciencias.unam.mx